

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/520,988	WEESE ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DAVID P. RASHID	2624	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DAVID P. RASHID (examiner) (3) _____

(2) TOM KOCOVSKY (Req. No. 28,383) (4) _____

Date of interview: 11 May 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1-4, 6-8, 10-14, 19, 20, 23 and 25-30.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative agreed to the claim amendments suggested by the examiner, all of which would be implemented by examiner's amendment with applicant's consent. The examiner's amendment would result in allowability.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/David P Rashid/
Examiner, Art Unit 2624

/Bhavesh M Mehta/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624